



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion 'of the Scholar," and "The Superfluous in Education." The author does not agree for a moment with the champions of the "bread-and-butter theory of pedagogy," whose gospel is: "Teach the child that all knowledge can be disposed to some useful end. Cultivate early the habit of looking for the practical worth of everything that he learns, and let the student of later years bear constantly in mind that knowledge is power." He agrees as little with those who would make the high school and college into places for vocational training, and who would banish from their curricula "whatever does not contribute directly to efficiency in life." He agrees rather with Voltaire: *Le superflu, chose très nécessaire*. "A man always needs more than he uses." "An excess of power is an essential and significant factor in efficiency." The training of the mind is superior to the stocking of it with professional information. The essay on research is especially sane. Research prompted by pure love of intellectual exploration is shown by history to have had far more to do with real utility than so-called utilitarian research. "In the wake of discoverers in pure science follow the inventors." "A mind exclusively bent upon the idea of utility necessarily narrows the range of the imagination." "This, then, is the paradox of knowledge, that he who regards knowledge as his servant is never completely master of it; but whoever regards himself as the servant of knowledge, he alone is master in the world of thought."

The reading of these essays will give great pleasure to the apostles of the ideal; the apostles of the commonplace should read them as a matter of duty.

The Classic Myths in English Literature and Art. New edition, revised and enlarged. By CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1911. Pp. xli+597. \$1.60.

In the new edition of this well-known and useful book there are about fifty pages of new matter, consisting of a chapter on "The Ring of the Nibelung," and amplifications of the content of the original edition. The tale of Cupid and Psyche, for example, contains two pages more, the stories of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are expanded, and there are many insertions *passim*. A great improvement is noticeable in the illustrations: there are 189 instead of 110 cuts; many of those taken from Greek vases are either new or better executed; and the full-page illustrations are now mainly of famous sculptures or vase-paintings. A very commendable change is the insertion of titles under all the illustrations, which are also further explained by a brief note after each title in the list at the beginning of the book. The work should be in every school library, and on the shelf of every lover of literature.

GRANT SHOWERMAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Modern English: Its Growth and Present Use. By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. New York: Scribner, 1909. Pp. xi+357.

In so far as this work treats of history its chief value, viewed in contrast with other histories of the language—notably Toller's and Bradley's—results from a rearrangement of the usual material with many fresh and interesting examples under the headings, "The English People," "Language," "Inflections,"

"Sounds," "Words," and "Grammar." Its reliability as to facts, in view of the extended notice in *Englische Studien* (Vol. XLIII, pp. 426-32), calls for little comment here. Scholars will note, however, the author's retention (pp. 20, 26) of the discarded date 449 A.D. for the arrival of Hengist and Horsa; and the statement (p. 225): "In the year 1362, it had been ordered that pleadings in the law courts should be in English *and not* (the italics are mine) in French."

The chief interest of the work lies in its attitude toward present usage. If its dicta "now so often expressed," as the reviewer says, are right, those of nearly all classes in English composition are wrong. The author advocates and exemplifies simplified spelling on the principle of individual "liberty of choice" (pp. 174, 182). He advocates the adaptation of the individual's pronunciation to that of his local environment (p. 139), thus furthering rather than checking dialectical disintegration of the standard speech. He justifies the use of vague expressions such as "a nice day" (p. 204), on the ground that "the idea we want to express is not definite and specific, but vague and general." True, but the teacher of English usually prefers to combat that habit of mind. In treating grammar he shows the same liberalizing tendency, as where dealing with "shall" and "will" he is inclined to "encourage one to a disagreement with the strict law of the formal or literary usage" (p. 295); where he says that "data" as a singular "must be regarded as an established usage" (p. 296); where he avers that "*It is me* may be said to have fairly won its way, at least into good colloquial speech" (p. 301); and where he admits the non-possessive form depending on a verbal noun in *ing* (p. 303). His conclusion is: "The real guide to good grammar, to good English in all respects, is to be found in the living speech" (p. 323).

That this very widely held principle should lead to such unusual deductions is due to the author's conception of the speech of a democracy (p. 7), in which the speech of one region must have equal authority with that of another. "The speech of a democracy cannot be a class speech; it cannot be a traditional literary speech." He requires it to rest "upon the basis of national custom," but admits no means of rendering or keeping a custom national. The upshot of the matter is almost a *reductio ad absurdum*:

"The rustic with his dialect, and in his own homogeneous dialect community, realizes as much the purpose of language as the most polished speaker in the best society of the city. Each expresses himself satisfactorily and is understood satisfactorily, and more than this language cannot do. Our definition of good English is, therefore, very simple; any English that 'hits the mark' is good English" (p. 326).

Observe the entire parity of Shakespeare, Addison, George Ade, and Bridget O'Sullivan. The last has also "the gift o' the gab." Nevertheless, most educators and literary men conceive it to be a part of their function to maintain a standard of culture from generation to generation, measured by a use of language in which the quality of thought cannot easily be disengaged from the quality of form. Is there in fact any real analogy between the form of government and the form of speech? It would seem that in matters pertaining to the intellect there must always be a better and a worse, and therefore necessarily an aristocracy.

PERCY W. LONG